



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 31 January 2023

by Mr Kim Bennett BSc DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16th February 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/J2210/D/22/3307716

**Waltersville, Bullockstone Road, South of Thanet Way, Herne Bay, Kent
CT6 7NL**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr & Mrs Walters against the decision of Canterbury City Council
 - The application CA/22/00471, dated 28 February 2022, was refused by notice dated 7 July 2022.
 - The development proposed is a two storey extension to front and rear of property and associated internal and external alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property comprises a detached chalet bungalow located on the western side of Bullockstone Road to the south of the Thanet Way. It is part of a ribbon of predominantly residential development on this side of the road with open fields opposite.
4. The appellant argues that there is a diverse variety of architectural styles in the vicinity with no one architectural form dominating. It is further argued that there would be no forward projection on the site, the built form would not appear cramped and that overall, there would be an improved visual coherence to the property, consistent with the Council's policies.
5. At my site visit I took the opportunity to walk up and down this section of the road in order to gain a full appreciation of the local character. In that respect, I would agree with the appellant that there is a diverse range of architectural styles, and particularly as far as materials are concerned. However, apart from the larger form of the commercial garage slightly to the north, and a larger 1.5 storey detached dwelling beyond that, the scale and character of the properties in the immediate vicinity is that of small semi-detached or detached bungalows to either side. Beyond these to the north, there are further detached bungalows but which are similarly small in scale, before the built form increases slightly with larger dwellings. Because of the small scale character,

the appeal property is already slightly higher and more prominent than that of its neighbours.

6. At present, the property is well set back from the road, behind a substantial gated and walled entrance. Although it is not particularly prominent in the street scene, it is however clearly visible from both directions, and especially so from the south as one comes down the slight hill at that point. In this context, the proposed development would not only involve an overall increase in height, but a substantial associated increase in bulk and massing because of the full width two storey form, extending a long way back into the site, and the large hipped roof. The combined impact of built form would make it unduly prominent in my view, with a development which would relate poorly to the small scale character of its neighbours in particular. This would be compounded by the relatively narrow width of the plots and the fact that development would be adjacent to either side boundary. Because of the small scale of adjoining buildings, the bulk and massing of development would also be clearly apparent when approaching from either direction.
7. Whilst I acknowledge that the design would be visually coherent as required by Policy DBE6 of the Canterbury District Local Plan 2017 (LP), that policy also requires that extensions should be compatible with the character of the original building. In this instance that would clearly not be the case given the extent of the proposed extensions and alterations to the existing building.
8. A combination of the above factors leads me to find that there would be significant harm to the character and appearance of the immediate locality.
9. With regard to other matters, I noted the relationship with the adjoining dwellings but agree with the Council that although there would be some impact upon occupiers of those dwellings, it would be acceptable. Similarly, had I reached a different finding I am satisfied that any potential loss of privacy at the rear arising from the proposed first floor terrace, could have been overcome through the imposition of suitable screening by condition.
10. Notwithstanding the above and for the reasons set out, the proposed development would be contrary to Policies DBE3 and DBE6 of the LP in that it would not make a positive contribution to the local context, the scale and massing would be unacceptable, it would not be compatible with the character of the original building and it would be detrimental to the character of the locality.
11. Accordingly, the appeal should be dismissed.

Kim Bennett

INSPECTOR